DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 595 EA 024 624

AUTHOR Purnell, Susanna; Hill, Paul
TITLE Time for Reform.
INSTITUTION Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, New York, N.Y.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-8330-1284-3; RAND/R-4234-EMC
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 54p.
AVAILABLE FROM RAND, 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; *Educational Change; *Efficiency; Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Workload; *Scheduling; *School Restructuring; *Time Management
IDENTIFIERS Rand Corporation

ABSTRACT

Integral to school restructuring is the need to create time for school staff to participate in developing a vision, setting goals, formulating plans, training, and exchanging experiences. The use of time is both the object of and the chief impediment to change. The study surveyed educational literature, and business management journals, supplementing these with interviews and data from other Rand studies. "A Timely Problem," the first of four sections, documents the substantial demands for time associated with restructuring. "The Role of Time in Achieving Change" examines how change requires: (1) removing some existing demands on time; (2) adequate investments of time and resources during implementation; and (3) sustained commitment. Successful implementation relies on scheduling time with appropriate lengths, frequency, and availability to key participants. "Time-Creation Devices" outlines six major approaches, including promoting time outside the classroom, refocusing existing commitments, rescheduling, prolonging the work year, and enhancing the efficiency of time use. "Promoting Time for Reform" makes specific policy recommendations for broad application throughout the educational system. (TEJ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED354595

Time for Reform

Susanna Purnell, Paul Hill

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E D. Gill

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA024624

RAND

The research described in this report was supported by the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation under Grant 05890.

ISBN: 0-8330-1284-3

RAND is a nonprofit institution that seeks to improve public policy through research and analysis. Publications of RAND do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the sponsors of RAND research.

Published 1992 by RAND
1700 Main Street, P.O. Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138

R-4234-EMC

Time for Reform

Susanna Purnell, Paul Hill

Supported by
The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation

RAND

PREFACE

This study examines an issue that is embedded in the process of education reform: the need to create time for school staff to participate in developing a vision, setting goals and formulating plans, receiving training, exchanging ideas and experiences, and practicing and adopting specific reform elements. The issue is critical to a wide variety of organizations that influence the restructuring of schools, including education agencies at all levels of government, unions, foundations, businesses in partnership with schools, and education networks as well as building-level administrators and staff. This study underscores the requirement for adequate time as part of any plan to change a school and identifies some of the specific ways these organizations can facilitate time creation in support of reform.

The study was funded by The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, which sponsors programs promoting school reform. Within RAND, the project was conducted under the auspices of the Human Resources and Education Program of the Domestic Research Division.

SUMMARY

An integral part of any attempt to restructure a school is the need to create time for the school staff to help design, endorse, and enact that reform. What makes this requirement such a challenge is that schools must continue the process of education for their students while instigating changes in the organization, curriculum, or pedagogy of the school. Unlike retail stores that display notices in the window proclaiming themselves closed for inventory, repairs, or remodeling, schools must continue to provide services for their customers.

The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, which supports a number of programs promoting education reform, asked RAND to look at how schools involved in change are grappling with the issue of time and identify the methods used to create staff time for reform. Based on a review of the relevant education and business literature as well as interviews with representatives of over 40 organizations involved in changing schools, this report serves as a resource for organizations such as educational agencies, unions, foundations, business partners, and the school itself in developing and promoting plans that incorporate time for restructuring a school.

TIME ISSUES RELATED TO CHANGE

When schools, districts, and foundations plan the strategies and tactics of reform, the issue of time becomes an important consideration. First, the basis of any major restructuring of a school must be the readjustment of priorities. Time is a finite resource. Simply adding school reform to the list of "things to do" trivializes the process and reduces the time available for every item on the list. Prerequisites for creating adequate time for reform are the ability to reallocate priorities, the abandonment of policies or practices that no longer contribute to the new mission, and resistance to competing reforms that could divert time and attention from that mission.

Second, any attempt at creating time for reform requires investment. Schools need to find some source that will provide the resources to create enough slack for teachers to identify, design, and begin implementing changes while the school continues to function.

Third, the incremental nature of change has implications for providing adequate time for teachers to participate in restructuring a

school. Expectations concerning how quickly a change can be made need to be placed in a realistic time frame. Those planning and funding a reform often must be prepared to persist for years before seeing expected changes come to fruition. Time allocations for teacher participation should reflect the whole change process by not only enabling teacher attendance at events but also providing time for experimentation, follow-up assistance, and practice. And, in addition to the substance of the reform, teachers need time to learn the process skills required to advance through the various phases of change.

Finally, within the school, the tactics of allocating appropriate time slots should reflect the character of the reform. The designation of a specific date and time influences which teachers can participate and what can be accomplished. In determining appropriate time allocation, district and building-level administrators should consider which staff members need to work together for how often and how long. Meeting and event schedulers also need to consider what else is competing for that time slot. If there is a real commitment on the part of the district and school staff to restructuring a school, there should be a willingness to make reform activities fundamental to the school calendar.

TIME-CREATION DEVICES

In implementing a change strategy, reformers are still faced with the nuts-and-bolts problems of wresting time from the school calendar. This study constructs an inventory of general approaches supplemented by specific examples of devices that create opportunities for teachers to meet, plan, train, observe, and reflect.

In general, schools employ six approaches for creating time:

- Increase nonclassroom time for teachers during the course of the school day.
- Refocus existing time slots to new uses.
- Reschedule the school day.
- Increase the total amount of time available.
- Encourage teachers to use their own time.
- Promote more efficient time use.

Employment of the devices associated with each of these approaches varies in appropriateness, cost, and feasibility at a specific site. Section 3 of this report offers interested readers a wide-ranging list of

specific time-creation methods as well as some discussion of the advantages or disadvantages associated with their use.

LOWERING THE BARRIERS TO TIME AND REFORM

Those who direct or influence public education and the current effort to reform that system can assist schools in creating adequate time for change by

- Providing or enlisting adequate resources to support the time and energy demands of reform;
- Employing change strategies that feature realistic milestones and sustaining support for practicing and eventually incorporating changes at the school and classroom level;
- Facilitating waivers of policies, mandates, and contract provisions that limit time for staff participation;
- Minimizing administrative requirements associated with the reform;
- Refraining from the introduction of competing programs or reform agendas;
- Incorporating nonclassroom time for teachers as a routine part of the school day or calendar; and
- Exploring ways of reorganizing schools and enhancing teacher job descriptions to make time spent on the continuous revitalization of the schools integral to the education system.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As is always the case, the authors have benefited greatly from the contributions of others in bringing this report to fruition. First and foremost, the authors would like to thank Hayes Mizell of The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation for his support of this study. In addition, we extend our appreciation to all those who shared their time and expertise during interviews conducted as part of the research. Amy Praskac contributed substantially to the project, doing most of the network interviews; Nancy Rizor conducted several of the school district interviews. A number of people helped us with comments on the draft of the report, including Stephanie Hirsch, David Hornbeck, Bertha Pendleton, Sophie Sa, Richard Wallace, and Anne Wheelock. Within RAND, Iris Rothberg and Lawrence Hanser provided useful technical reviews. Finally, we would like to thank Arthur Wise, who originally proposed this study and its title.

CONTENTS

PREFACE iii

SUMMARY v

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ix

Section

1. A TIMELY PROBLEM 1
   - Time Demands Associated with Change 1
   - How This Study Was Done 4
   - Organization of This Report 6

2. THE ROLE OF TIME IN ACHIEVING CHANGE 7
   - The Need to Adjust Priorities 7
   - Provision of Adequate Resources 11
   - Realistic Time Expectations and the Change Process 12
   - Linking Time Allocation to the Character of the Reform 18

3. TIME-CREATION DEVICES 21
   1. Promote Time Outside the Classroom During the School Day 22
   2. Refocus the Purpose of Existing Time Commitments 28
   3. Reschedule the School Day 29
   4. Increase the Amount of Time Available 32
   5. Promote Volunteer Time 34
   6. Promote More Efficient Time Use 36

4. PROMOTING TIME FOR REFORM 40
   - Lowering Barriers to Creating Time 40
   - Making the Organization of School Time the Object of Reform 42

1. A TIMELY PROBLEM

Successful school reform requires adequate time for teachers to participate in that change. Ironically, how a school organizes and uses time is both the object of restructuring and the chief impediment to change. Dissatisfaction with the status quo fuels the effort to restructure the school, but the resources required to make a change, including time, are organized to sustain the existing structure. Change requires a reallocation of time, but this can conflict with the conventional school practices, tradition, rules and regulations, collective bargaining agreements, and other determinants of time use.

This study explores how schools attempting major structural changes have provided time for the staff to take part in the planning, implementation, and institutionalization of those changes. It is not a chronicle of startling innovations, although we did discover some clever time-creation devices. Instead, it has become a story of steadfastness and singlemindedness. Schools serious about restructuring employ a variety of time-creation approaches, but more important, they make a long-term commitment to sustaining the change process and are willing to trade off other uses of time to support that change.

Organizations like The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, which promote comprehensive reform efforts in the schools, understand how difficult it is to enlist adequate staff time for restructuring. This study represents one way the foundation is focusing more attention and effort on solving the problem.

TIME DEMANDS ASSOCIATED WITH CHANGE

Any restructuring of a school—that is, any attempt to change the makeup, organization, or pattern of the school through such activities as redefining missions, changing governance structures, introducing new curricula, promoting teaching methods, or influencing the school culture—takes time to formulate, plan, implement, and become routine practice. Teachers spend time not only attending and participating in events such as workshops, courses, meetings, and conferences, they also spend time researching, negotiating, observing, practicing, evaluating and sharing the progress, and making adjustments in the reform.

Because current reforms are aimed at strengthening the school as a whole, time demands associated with change are greater than in the

past. Restructuring requires teacher interaction and classroom collaboration. Traditionally, staff development activities focused on upgrading the skills of individual teachers; now they stress collegiality and peer coaching. In pedagogy and curriculum, the trend is toward cross-disciplinary and team teaching as well as articulation across grades. In governance, the trend is toward increased teacher empowerment through participation in site-based decisions on scheduling, curricula, teaching techniques, student discipline, and choice of extracurricular activities.

The time demands associated with change in a school are substantial. Few estimates of the number of hours or days associated with various types of reform exist, but those we do have indicate substantial investments on the part of the participating teachers. In a 1985–1986 survey of 178 urban high schools enacting major change, principals most frequently identified lack of time and energy on the part of teachers and lack of money as the major implementation problems. The survey also showed that, on the average, each participating teacher devoted 70 days over a three- to four-year period to the project. Moreover, the more successful schools used 50 days a year of external assistance for training, coaching, and capacity-building.[1] Estimates of time requirements made by staff of the Effective Schools Network, which helps schools develop and implement improvement plans, add up to time commitments of 10 to 20 teacher days per month. This consists of not only the eight hours per month devoted to school improvement team meetings (which can include up to one-fifth of the faculty) but all the work that is done outside the meeting to gather and analyze relevant data and distribute the results.[2]

Even if the reform is as limited as introducing one new teaching technique, the time demands associated with that change can be substantial. For example, in one estimate a moderately difficult teaching strategy could require that teachers receive 20 to 30 hours of instruction in its theory, 15 to 20 classroom demonstrations, and 10 to 15 coaching sessions before mastering the technique and incorporating it into routine classroom practice.[3] Several district staff development

---

[1]See Karen Seashore Louis and Matthew B. Miles, *Improving the Urban High School: What Works and Why*, New York: Teachers College Press, 1990.

[2]Telephone interview with Barbara Jacoby, Effective School Products, Ltd., April 17, 1991.

[3]See Robert J. Garmston, "How Administrators Support Peer Coaching," *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 44, February 1, 1987. Garmston's source for this estimate is Linda Shalaway, "Peer Coaching . . . Does It Work?" *R&D Notes*, National Institute of Education, September 1985.

specialists noted that the ideal way to introduce a new program was to provide three to five days of training during the summer with follow-up throughout the year, about four to five hours per month per teacher.

In the private sector, factories shut down for retooling and stores close for remodeling. The restructuring of schools, on the other hand, takes place while the school continues to operate. Thus, the time needed for reform begins to appear really daunting when placed next to the everyday time demands of the teaching profession. In secondary schools, days are parceled out into usually equalized periods of time, a system perpetrated at the turn of the century when the first clock-timers were marketed to schools. One company called their bell-ringing clock the Autocrat and advertised that it would "call 'time' on the teacher who rides hobbies in public school work, who devotes fifty minutes to teaching Geography and ten minutes to Arithmetic," and impose discipline and regularity on the school.[4] Under today's autocrat, secondary teachers receive a minimum of one free period during the day. However, this cannot really be characterized as free time because teachers need planning time, time to review homework, time to call parents, time to photocopy. In his study of high schools, Theodore Sizer estimates that an average high school teacher works a 60-hour week. This estimate is based on teaching five classes of 30 students each, devoting ten minutes' preparation to each class and five minutes per week to each student's homework assignments (at 150 students that adds up to 12.5 hours) in addition to time spent on administrative and supervisory duties, extracurricular work, lunch periods, and commutes.[5]

Elementary school teachers have a smaller number of students but an even more demanding day in that they have a greater responsibility for student supervision and custody and tend to get less free time during school, time usually dependent on sending students to an elective teacher of subjects such as physical education or art.

There is little indication that the daily demands of the classroom have shrunk to make time for reform. A 1988 national survey of teachers concerning the effects of five years of reform indicated that school staff are even more caught up in the day-to-day concerns of their

---

[4]Michael O'Malley, *Keeping Watch: A History of American Time*, New York: Penguin, 1990, pp. 156–158.

[5]See Theodore R. Sizer, *Horace's Compromise*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1985.

classrooms.[6] For example, one-third of the responding teachers reported that class sizes had actually increased over the five-year period. Only one-fifth reported a decrease in class size or more freedom from noninstructional duties. A mere 16 percent indicated that they had more time for preparation and planning, while over one-half said that their paperwork was heavier than that of five years ago.

Efforts to restructure a school put additional demands on an already demanding schedule. The difficulty is not just in creating time for the individual teacher to participate in change but to create time during which groups of teachers can work on change together. This is difficult in a school workplace characterized by isolation, autonomy, and a master schedule that can free up only a few teachers at a time.

HOW THIS STUDY WAS DONE

The challenge is finding adequate time for reform; schools employ numerous ways to create time for planning, implementing, and institutionalizing change. The objective of this study is to identify those strategies and the best ways to employ them by examining the experiences and advice of a wide variety of participants in reform—both inside and outside local systems.

Several data-collecting methods were employed. First, the professional literature was surveyed. Few articles and books exist on this topic and they tend to address only the time-management aspects of the problem. However, an extensive literature exists that documents the efforts of individual schools to enact change. Professional journals and published studies contain accounts by participants, case studies, and surveys of schools or school systems making changes. By reviewing the literature published since 1986, it is possible to extrapolate ways these schools created time and to get some indication of how strategies for creating time influenced the change process. These accounts also helped us identify candidates for interviews.

The survey of the education research literature was supplemented by a review of business management journals from the last two years. Although there are differences in the organization and motivation of private corporations as compared to those of public school systems, the experiences of the business world, in terms of coping with change, can provide insights that relate to creating time for change in schools. Moreover, there are some parallel developments in both worlds, as in

[6]See *Report Card on School Reform: The Teachers Speak*, Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1988.

the example of corporate trends toward decentralization of authority and increasing reliance on teams to formulate and implement changes in the workplace. The review therefore concentrated on journal articles related to corporate restructuring rather than time management.

Interviews, both in person and by telephone, were a major source of data for the study. Unlike the literature search, interviews provided a resource that focused on the issue of time. We pursued this source of data using two basic strategies. First, we contacted existing networks that promote new models of schools, such as the Coalition for Essential Schools, Accelerated Schools, and Effective Schools. We also talked with networks for change sponsored by foundations, such as The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, and by states, such as Washington's Schools for the 21st Century. In these interviews, we addressed the general problem of creating time and how the provision of adequate time fit into the overall strategy of those in the network. We asked network personnel to identify what had worked or had not worked in creating time and to suggest any schools or districts within the network that it might be beneficial to contact.

The second set of interviews consisted of referrals gathered from the initial interviews, the literature, and colleagues. We were able to contact a wide variety of sources in district staff development offices, professional organizations, college faculties, and individual schools. Again, we tried to find out not only the strategies employed but the appropriateness, advantages, disadvantages, and costs associated with each strategy.

In all, we conducted interviews with representatives of over 40 organizations involved in school-level reform: 15 with school districts, ten with school-level administration, ten with school restructuring networks, and 16 with union and professional organizations, state education offices, and schools of education. We also attended meetings of schools that were members of reform networks associated with RJR Nabisco, the Effective Schools Movement, and the GE Foundation.

Finally, we took advantage of other studies being conducted by RAND. All the participants in this study were involved in extensive fieldwork for other education projects. These provided opportunities to find out how a variety of schools and districts dealt with the time demands of a new program or change in the school. Similarly, project members took advantage of attendance at conventions, workshops, or other professional meetings to gain insight into time-related issues from both the formal program presentations and the informal contacts with other attendees.

ORGANIZATION OF THIS REPORT

The balance of this paper is divided into three sections. Section 2 examines issues related to the strategy and tactics of providing adequate time, such as avoiding competing priorities or time allocations that undermine the intent of the activity. Section 3 provides an inventory of time-creation devices derived from our survey. It combines general approaches with specific illustrations of how some schools have created blocks of time for teachers. The concluding section delineates ways the various participants in education reform can assist schools in providing adequate time and speculates that the organization of staff time may itself become the object of school reform.

2. THE ROLE OF TIME IN ACHIEVING CHANGE

The provision of time for teacher participation is vital to both the overall strategy and specific tactics of changing a school. This section addresses the role of time in planning and implementing reform. First, time is a finite resource; any change strategy that adds new time demands eventually requires reallocating priorities and removing some existing demands. Second, any attempt at creating time for reform requires adequate investment so that staff can design and implement changes while continuing to operate the school. Third, school improvement is not a single event but a process; it therefore requires a sustained commitment of time, not simply a large front-end investment. Fourth, the tactical allocation of time must take into account the character of the reform being attempted. Successful implementation rests on scheduling time with appropriate lengths, frequency, and availability to the key program participants.

THE NEED TO ADJUST PRIORITIES

An immediate issue in developing a change strategy is that in most schools the available time has been dedicated to existing programs and agendas. To find time for the staff to participate in the reform, priorities in the school must be adjusted to reflect this new mission, and in most instances some efforts have to be abandoned to facilitate the process.

For most schools, the choices are made in the context of existing mandates and programs generated at the federal and state levels. The result is often an overabundance of programs and requirements. As one New York suburban elementary principal complained, the "state education department continued to crank out new curriculum guides and syllabi without ever offering practical suggestions as to how to implement all this new material . . . never a recommendation as to what to remove from the present curriculum to allow time to teach the new material. Like pouring water into an already filled-to-the-brim glass, one cannot continue to add to an already bloated elementary curriculum without something spilling out."[1]

[1]Allan S. Vann, "How to Deal with a Bloated Elementary Curriculum," *Principal*, January 1990. Federal education programs can aggravate the situation. For example, see Jackie M. Kimbrough and Paul T. Hill, *The Aggregate Effects of Federal Education*

Those we interviewed argued that the problem is compounded at the district level where a number of programs and requirements are levied by a variety of district officials, often without consulting each other or the schools concerned. One district staff developer likened the situation to a cabinet form of government in which each department secretary formulates a separate agenda and set of programs without reference to the other departments. Curriculum coordinators, staff developers, and other administrators all promote their own agendas and requirements. Often no one in the district assesses what cumulative burden is being imposed at the school level or even if the various departments are implementing programs that complement or conflict with each other. It is up to the schools to reconcile uncoordinated demands from the district office.

At the school level, the net effect can be perceived as capricious. Teachers dutifully respond to each new initiative, expecting that it will soon be followed by another. They talk of having to participate in programs because their principal has "volunteeritis," trying to please his superiors by enrolling his school in every new district initiative; the curriculum coordinator went to some seminar and got all enthused about a program; or the district staff developer is using the program in a Ph.D. thesis. In such instances, teachers may not view the program as very relevant to their own situation. The program becomes an add-on rather than being perceived as a new opportunity to improve the delivery of instruction in that school.[2]

Part of the change strategy then becomes reallocating the priorities within the school. Lezotte and Jacoby suggest that any attempt at change should be "accompanied by a thoughtful consideration of how it will impact classroom and school practices and what current policies, procedures or practices might be appropriately abandoned."[3] Until this is done, teachers will continue to see the reform as an addi-

---

Programs, RAND, R-2638-ED, September 1981. This study found that federal programs can interfere with local core programs in a variety of ways.

[2]Peter Drucker notes, "In organizations, where most knowledge and service work take place, splintered attention is more and more the norm. The people at the very top can sometimes concentrate themselves (though far too few even try). But the great majority of engineers, teachers, salespeople, nurses, middle managers, and the like must carry a steadily growing load of busywork, activities that contribute little if any value and that have little if anything to do with what these professionals are qualified and paid for." See Peter Drucker, "The New Productivity Challenge," *Harvard Business Review*, November–December 1991, p. 74.

[3]Lawrence E. Lezotte and Barbara C. Jacoby, *A Guide to the School Improvement Process Based on Effective Schools Research*, Okemos, Michigan: Effective Schools Products, Ltd., 1990, p. 119.

tional demand rather than a new way of defining the school, as in the example of the team teacher who never had enough time because he tried to teach both the previous curriculum and the new interdisciplinary one.

Many schools have difficulty making "abandonment" part of their reform. Both district and foundation officials related experiences that illustrated that schools often are uncertain about what they can change. For example, one elementary school was convinced that regulations governing retention in grade prevented the school from converting to an ungraded approach. Only after the foundation sponsoring the reform checked first with the district and then with the state government did school officials find out that there were no existing regulations preventing the change.

The experiences of U.S. corporations give some clues as to the organizational barriers to change. A review of how 12 business firms terminated major product lines concluded that large organizations have difficulty ending major activities, but when they do, it is usually in the context of a corporate strategic decision to continue or initiate another activity. Like schools, businesses seldom terminate existing activities until they are forced to do so. Most activities that were terminated had been unproductive for a long time, but they were eliminated only when the business needed to free up resources to pursue a promising new strategy. Termination involved the leadership and support of top management, often using nonroutine procedures to accomplish the task.[4]

Similarly, we discovered examples of state and local education agencies incorporating a waiver process (exemption from specific regulations or requirements) as a way to support new education strategies. An example is the partnership between Hillsborough County School District in Florida and the GTE Education Initiative to promote school-based management. The district allowed participating schools to request variances from a wide range of district regulations, including school board policies, handbooks, and manuals influencing the operation of the school day. In a one-year period, 39 schools requested

[4]See Susan J. Bodilly, *Twelve Case Studies of Termination and Divestitures by Business Firms*, RAND, N-2339-AF, April 1986. Findings from this Note are incorporated in a RAND report on the difficulty the U.S. Air Force has in terminating major programs. See Paul T. Hill, Thomas K. Glennan, Jr., and Susan J. Bodilly, *Obstacles to the Termination of Air Force Activities*, RAND, R-3303-AF, April 1986.

155 variances from a variety of regulations preventing school control over staffing, curriculum, and scheduling of the school day.[5]

At the district level, the provisions of contracts negotiated with teachers, support staff, and transportation companies also can make it difficult to create time, especially since contracts usually address working conditions. We found a number of instances in which contract waivers allowed willing teachers to extend their day. In other instances, the restrictions held, such as one school district contract that specified that principals could convene after-school meetings for a total of only two and one-half hours per month.

Barriers to creating time for change vary from location to location, as does the perception of how easy it might be to remove those hindrances. In some states or districts, obtaining waivers is a fairly easy, sometimes informal process. In other areas, principals find it a daunting prospect, akin to running a gauntlet, with little assurance of obtaining the prized waiver at the end of the application process. The biggest barrier to reallocating priorities, however, may be the established traditions and inflexibility of the status quo. Administrators and teachers need to be energized to change existing priorities by going to the trouble of changing the master schedule, banishing nonproductive programs and practices, and advocating new approaches that might break some of the old rules of how it is always done.

Finally, a successful change strategy involves extending the embargo on competing programs for the duration of the program's implementation. For example, one principal told of the school's experience with a foundation promoting a new instructional approach. In its zeal to provide the school with extensive resources and programs aimed at that change, the foundation flooded the school with too many oppor-

---

[5]See Memo to Walter L. Sickles, Hillsborough County Superintendent, from Marilyn T. Wittner, Director of Instructional Personnel, Subject: *1991-92 Site-Based Decision Making Proposals—Content and Variances*, May 16, 1991.

In other examples, the North Carolina legislature also provided greater latitude to six schools participating in Project Design, a restructuring program stressing building-level management begun in 1986. The project could not get under way until the North Carolina legislature lifted all state laws and regulations at the six school sites for the two years of the program. Similarly, Illinois state legislation passed in 1991 set up a waiver application process for schools participating in the state-supported Accelerated Schools Program. And in 1987, when the Washington state legislature authorized the Schools for the 21st Century Program to encourage local initiatives for restructuring, the legislation allowed participating schools to petition state and local authorities for waivers. See Bettye MacPhail-Wilcox, Roy Forbes, and Barbara Parramore, "Project Design: Reforming Structure and Process," *Educational Leadership*, April 1990; and Washington State Board of Education, *Report to the Legislature on the Schools for the 21st Century Program*, Olympia, Washington: Office of the Schools for the 21st Century Program, January 1991.

tunities. Teachers who ended up attending as many as six different staff development programs in one year could not assimilate, let alone implement, all the different approaches. Finally, the district coordinator for the program limited each teacher to only two programs, one chosen as a schoolwide effort and one of individual interest. School staff need exposure to new ideas, but that exposure should be thematic, not fragmented. Schools that take on too many reform activities at once often end up creating a new need for abandonment.

PROVISION OF ADEQUATE RESOURCES

Creating time for reform requires investment. Teachers have to invest extra time and energy as participants in restructuring the school. In addition, the school has to find some source—the school board, the state, federal categorical programs, foundations, or businesses—that provides the extra resources to create "slack," the capacity within the school to decide on, design, and begin implementing changes while the existing structure is in place.

The needs for time and resources are interlocking requirements for reform. In their survey of urban high schools enacting reform, Louis and Miles found that principals most frequently cited insufficient resources of time and money as a prime problem in carrying out a program of reform.[6] Funding is considered an underlying resource because it buys other program resources, such as training, other technical assistance, staff, materials, and equipment. Most important, it buys teachers' time by providing monies for substitutes, retreats, and summer institutes or planning sessions.

Provision of adequate resources becomes a prerequisite for reform. Networks often make this a precondition for working with a school. The letter of agreement between the Coalition of Essential Schools and an applicant school, for instance, states that "the school agrees to provide sufficient funds from district and/or private sources for staff development and planning within the school." Schools are required to demonstrate the likelihood of such funding over a four-year commitment.

The increase in funding needed to sponsor significant changes in a school varies but appears to be small relative to the cost of running a school. Again, in their survey of urban high schools, Louis and Miles

[6]Louis and Miles, op. cit. In their survey of 178 urban high schools enacting major change, 88 percent of the principals named lack of time as a major or minor problem and 76 percent cited fiscal resources (p. 239).

estimated that by adding the equivalent of 1 or 2 percent of the operating expenses, major changes could be enacted over a period of several years.[7]

Failure to provide such extra resources or "slack" to a school can doom a program. Teachers and other school participants regard the availability and allocation of resources as indicative of how serious administrators in the school and district are about the reform. Without such commitment from management, teachers are likely to feel that dedicating their own time to the effort will simply be a waste of time.[8]

REALISTIC TIME EXPECTATIONS AND THE CHANGE PROCESS

Change in any school, whether in governance, pedagogy, or curriculum, is a process. Teachers do not adopt new teaching methods or become co-managers of schools overnight. Rather, change happens incrementally as new skills and activities are learned and become routine.

The organization of teachers into interdisciplinary teams provides a good illustration of innovation as a process. There is considerable literature describing the phases a team goes through while attempting to integrate curriculum and instruction. Researchers identify as many as five stages of development and note that the stages are evolutionary; i.e., each phase contributes the prerequisite conditions for the next.[9] For example, almost every description of teaming notes that the beginning phase is organizational, laying the ground rules for team meetings and developing general management policies such

---

[7]Ibid., see Chapter 10. Louis and Miles found that operating a moderate-sized urban high school in the mid-1980s cost about four to five million dollars per year. They estimated that an urban high school could enact major changes with at least an additional $50,000 to $100,000 per year over the course of several years.

[8]The business literature reflects a similar conclusion. In a discussion of what determines group effectiveness, Shea and Guzzo write that "apparent lack of motivation by group members . . . may reflect the conviction that they have been set up to fail. A question or two may reveal, for example, that top management failed to respond to group member requests for support on the project. The members then concluded that their charter was a farce, the spoken commitment of top management a charade. They felt impotent and acted accordingly." Gregory P. Shea and Richard A. Guzzo, "Group Effectiveness: What Really Matters?" *Sloan Management Review*, Spring 1987.

[9]See for example, Thomas O. Erb and Nancy M. Doda, *Team Organization: Promise—Practices and Possibilities*, National Education Association of the United States, 1989; Paul S. George, "Interdisciplinary Team Organization: Four Operational Phases," *Middle School Journal*, 13:3 (May 1982); and Gene Pickler, "The Evolutionary Development of Interdisciplinary Teams," *Middle School Journal*, 18:2 (February 1987).

as student discipline. Learning to work together on these issues increases team members' knowledge and trust of each other so they can consider extending that coordination to curricular and instructional matters. The process takes years, and some teams never reach the final phase.

The incremental nature of change has implications for the strategic view of providing time for teachers to participate in the reform. First, expectations concerning how quickly a change can be made need to be placed in a realistic time frame. Second, time allocation cannot be just event-oriented but must support the whole change process by also providing time for experimentation, follow-up assistance, and practice. Finally, in addition to mastering the substance of the reform, participants need time to learn the process skills required to advance through the various phases of change.

Duration

A recurrent theme of the school-level study interviews was that change took longer than anticipated. Most foundations offer grants for a minimum of three years in the belief that it takes at least that long to instigate change in a school. However, a number of foundation officials have pushed support for restructuring programs to five or more years, and one interviewee has concluded that a decade might be the most realistic time frame.

The experience of the networks promoting specific models for change confirms the perception that restructuring a school takes years. For example, the School Development Program is based on a model developed by James Comer to deal with the whole child by trying to understand and correct underlying problems or prevent their manifestations. Network staff tell schools joining the program that it takes approximately two years to get the basic mechanism, the school planning and governance team, in place. The first six months are spent gathering information, conducting a needs assessment, and recruiting governance team members. Similarly, those affiliated with the Coalition for Essential Schools estimate that it takes three or four years for a school to begin demonstrating the characteristics of the essential school model.

In their study of what works in improving high schools, Louis and Miles identify one of the more successful change strategies as using "evolutionary planning."[10] The school develops and continues to

[10]Louis and Miles, op. cit. See especially Chapters 7 and 9.

strive toward a specific goal in terms of image and mission but keeps reviewing and adjusting the strategies used to get there. Such an approach allows the school to take advantage of or adjust to changing environments. It also places the change process in a more realistic time frame. For example, the study found that in schools involved in change for several years, principals anticipated that it would take many more years to achieve their goals. Those in the early stages tended to view it as a two- or three-year effort. By taking a very long-term view, the authors argue, school leaders are better able to deal with short-term setbacks and pursue more realistic short-term goals within the context of a long-range mission.

Sustaining the Change Process

One of the most difficult aspects of change for schools is to allocate time to support the entire change process. Too often, time allocations reflect a propensity on the part of administrators to support the more formal activities associated with a reform but to leave teachers to their own devices when it comes to the follow-up practice and routinization of the reform. For example, one school system is adopting a staff development program that encourages teachers to conduct peer observations. The districts in the system provide release time for teachers to attend a training course in peer observation and to do the course assignments of practicing this technique back in their own classrooms. Principals use the release time for course attendance, but some are reluctant to use it for teachers' peer observation assignments in the school. They prefer the less costly approach of teachers using their own preparation, lunch, and after-school time to observe and conference with other teachers. Moreover, when teachers finish the course, few principals offer them further release time to continue practicing and using the technique. Although the program has generated widespread interest and enthusiasm among teachers for doing peer observations, few teachers have continued to use the technique after completing the course. The school system has expended considerable resources contracting outside trainers and paying teachers release time and expenses to attend the course, yet it has balked at the less costly follow-up time needed to make teachers' observing other teachers part of the school culture.

Staff development research over the past decade has confirmed that the process of changing teachers' beliefs and attitudes occurs only after they have tried new practices and observed positive results

with their students.[11] It is a process that develops with experience. Teachers tend to repeat successful activities but avoid unsuccessful ones. Therefore, trained teachers learning new approaches still require practice, feedback and correction, and more practice. The implications are that change is not only a lengthy process but one that requires continued activity and support.

In our survey for this study, we found that sustaining the long-term requirements for change was often a problem. One principal, talking of how the second year differed from the first year of a reform program, said, "In the beginning, the expectation was that we could send teachers out to courses and seminars and they could just meld what they learned into their instruction. We forgot the need for follow-up." In the second year, school staff only participated in training courses that featured follow-up sessions or school visits by the instructors several times throughout the year. In addition, several teachers were trained as program facilitators to provide school staff with more immediate assistance as problems arose. The principal viewed the latter strategy as particularly useful because he felt that "teachers get discouraged easily when a new method does not work," and that for this reason, most of the training provided the first year had limited influence on the school.

Other strategies to sustain a reform provide more formal and informal opportunities for teachers to share experiences and gather feedback. We found examples of portions of faculty meetings, department meetings, and in-services being devoted to teachers' exchanging information about trying new practices. In a number of programs, teachers attended regularly scheduled meetings to plan, compare experiences, and solve problems. Sometimes this was a voluntary activity created by the teachers themselves to support the process; sometimes it was part of the program design. Although the time of day these teachers met varied (lunch time, before and after school, or during the school day), principals and teachers always used adjectives like "sacred" or "sacrosanct" to describe the meeting time. They made it clear that there is never any competing activity scheduled for the same time period and the meeting time is never used for any other purpose.

Although the form in which long-term support of new practices is provided varies, reform initiatives cannot succeed without continuing to provide time for sustaining activities.

---

[11]Thomas R. Guskey, "Staff Development and the Process of Teacher Change," *Educational Researcher*, May 1986.

Taking Time to Develop Process Skills

In addition to training and practice in the substance of a reform, teachers often need training in the process that supports the change. One aspect of change in a school is that it involves developmental growth on the part of the participants.[12] In many reforms, teachers whose school activities have been confined primarily to their own classrooms are being asked to collaborate with other teachers in instruction, curriculum development, and governance of the school. Relations among teachers are also affected when reforms create new job descriptions in which selected teachers act as peer leaders, facilitators, and coaches.

Strategies for reform have to include time for teachers to receive training and/or develop process skills. If it is not part of the initial training, participants often ask for help in this area once changes have been implemented. For example, after the first year of interdisciplinary teaming in one middle school, teachers asked for help in conflict resolution. Similarly, only after a Colorado school district was already a year or two into a school improvement program aimed at promoting site-based management did the administration realize that they had made a strategic error in not providing training in shared decisionmaking. The district rectified the situation in part by conducting workshops for teachers and administrators in facilitation, conflict resolution, communication skills, and participatory decisionmaking.[13]

The lessons learned by the Colorado school district are similar to those drawn from the corporations and businesses that have decentralized authority and reorganized the workplace into teams.[14] The GTE Education Initiative with Hillsborough County draws on GTE's

---

[12]See Shirley M. Hord et al., *Taking Charge of Change*, Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1987.

[13]Cynthia R. Harrison, Joellen P. Killion, and James E. Mitchell, "Site-Based Management: The Realities of Implementation," *Educational Leadership*, May 1989.

[14]One account that mirrors the learning experience of the school district implementing site-based management is that of Ralph Stayer, the CEO of a family-owned food processing firm. In an effort to increase employee motivation and thereby the quality and marketability of the firm's product, Stayer restructured the company so that teams of line workers took over a number of functions previously performed by management. The team was responsible for certain management functions, and team leaders were chosen to serve as communication links. Stayer found that "no sooner had the team leaders been appointed, however, than they began to function as supervisors. In other words, they fell into the familiar roles they had always seen. We had neglected to give them and the plant managers adequate training in the new team model. *The structure was changed but the mind-sets didn't.*" Ralph Stayer, "How I Learned to Let My Workers Lead," *Harvard Business Review*, November–December 1990.

own experience in this area. The corporation's own management trainers participate in helping teachers learn the skills needed to work in teams as part of an effort to encourage more site-based management. The local teachers are expected to return to their schools and train their colleagues in such management skills as goal setting and problem solving.

Many of the networks we contacted have incorporated training on process skills into their program. In the Effective Schools model, members of the school improvement team are given at least some training on problem solving, team building and maintenance skills, and interpersonal skills.[15] Similarly, in implementing the Accelerated Schools model, network personnel observe that school staff are much more productive in terms of developing the program if they improve their group decisionmaking skills. This can be accomplished not only through the provision of training and outside consultants but also by providing more opportunities for staff to work together.[16]

Because much of the current reform stresses collaboration among teachers, most examples of process skills pertain to group decisionmaking and interpersonal relations. However, we also found schools dedicating time for teachers to become skilled in new technologies. A number of schools we contacted were using in-service time for teachers to learn word-processing programs and other computer skills. In a partnership arrangement between a school and a local high-technology business, a teacher spent the summer familiarizing himself with the same computers and software used in the school. The teacher then could facilitate increased use of the computers in the school because he had learned how to handle program crashes and the other glitches that often inhibit computer use. As a result the school staff were more likely to implement the various curricula using the computer.

Acquisition of process skills is often a hidden requirement in terms of providing time for reform. In designing a change strategy, planners should look not only at the requirements of the reform itself but at what assumptions have been made about the skills needed to implement it.

---

[15]Lezotte and Jacoby, op. cit.

[16]Wendy Hofenberg, Henry M. Levin, Gail Meister, and John Rogers, *Toward Accelerated Middle Schools*, School of Education, Stanford University, August 1990.

LINKING TIME ALLOCATION TO THE CHARACTER OF THE REFORM

Once a school has made the strategic decision to dedicate time for reform, the tactics of allocating appropriate time slots becomes important. The designation of a specific date and time influences who can participate and what can be accomplished. The form in which time is created should complement the purpose of the activity.

Selection of an appropriate time can be crucial to the success of a reform. For example, common planning time is essential to interdisciplinary teaming, and yet a 1989 survey of middle schools that use teams revealed that only about a third provided teachers with two or more hours of common planning time per week.[17] In fact, other studies on teaming have revealed that some schools have actually scheduled assignments for team members outside the building at the same time that other team members have planning time.[18]

In a similar example, a district implemented a teacher career enhancement program creating lead teachers responsible for providing administration liaison, technical assistance, and planning and conducting staff development and other instructional activities. However, instead of reducing the lead teachers' class load so they could work with other teachers during the school day, the district paid lead teachers a stipend to work outside normal school hours. As a result, other teachers perceived only the administration liaison aspect of the position. The time allotted for lead teacher activities did not overlap enough with that of other teachers in the school, but the time slot was conducive to interaction with the administrators.[19]

In determining an appropriate time allocation, district and building-level administrators should consider several factors.

Which staff members need to work together? As in the example of providing common planning time for teams, consideration should be given to whether the target population has the opportunity to participate. There is a substantial difference in scheduling a time when one teacher can coach another versus a time for a large number of teachers to attend a session of the faculty senate.

---

[17]Joyce L. Epstein and Douglas J. MacIver, *Education in the Middle Grades*, Johns Hopkins University Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools, 1989.

[18]Erb and Doda, op. cit.

[19]See Mark A. Smylie and Jack W. Denny, "Teacher Leadership: Tensions and Ambiguities in Organizational Perspective," *Educational Administrative Quarterly*, Vol. 26, No. 3, August 1990.

How often do key participants need time away from class or an opportunity to work together? Some restructuring mechanisms need routinized time assignments that become part of the school calendar, as in the example of governance team meetings; others are more infrequent, as in the example of attendance at workshops. Still others require an intense effort over a limited period of time, as in an ad hoc committee's development of a school improvement plan.

For how long must extra time and meeting opportunities be provided? The length of time required also can influence time creation. Teachers may have enough time during preparation and lunch periods to conference with each other, as in the example of the high school science department that meets weekly over lunch to share ideas and experiments. However, the same department would have trouble collaborating on a new curriculum given the same time period.

What is the competition? Staff members may have the necessary time away from the classroom, but that time may not be fully available for work on reform. For example, we talked with one district that scheduled a staff development course the week before a required exam. Teachers refused to attend because they wanted to remain in their classrooms and prepare their students for the test. All the competition is not necessarily from inside the school; one elementary school's attempt to organize an evening teachers' study group quickly failed when it became evident that most of the primary grade teachers already had signed up to use the local sauna that night.

Finally, the creation of appropriate time slots is aided by a willingness to make reform activities fundamental to the school. One would have to question the commitment of schools to reform if lead teachers were not given time to work with other teachers or teams had little or no common planning time. Erb and Doda warn that one of the traps to avoid when implementing teaming is to fail to place the needs of the team organization—i.e., assigning the same students to the team of teachers and providing that team with a common planning period—"at the top of the scheduling list so that all else revolves around it—and not the other way around."[20] If restructuring means refo-

[20]Erb and Doda, op. cit.

cusing the entire school toward a common mission and strategy, then the tactics of reform, such as assignment of time and place, should reflect that commitment.

3. TIME-CREATION DEVICES

In our survey, six general approaches emerged for creating time for teachers to meet, plan, attend training, or observe others. These include the following:

1. Promote time outside the classroom during the school day. A number of strategies exist to create both temporary and routine nonclassroom time for teachers during the course of the existing school day.

2. Refocus the purpose of existing time commitments. By appropriating existing time slots to new uses, this approach benefits from taking over an established activity in the school schedule instead of having to add a new activity.

3. Reschedule the school day. This category includes all the mechanisms by which the existing school day can be rearranged to accommodate the new requirements brought about by the implementation and institutionalization of a change.

4. Increase the amount of time available. This method adjusts the time frame to meet the demands of change by adding minutes, hours, or days to the teachers' work year.

5. Promote volunteer time. This category includes the many incentives employed to encourage teachers to use their own time to participate in changing the school.

6. Promote more efficient time use. The goal of this approach is to reduce the time associated with a task. It is a strategy for dealing with the time demands associated with change because it makes aspects of that change appear more manageable and less onerous in terms of the time commitments required of the participants.

The employment of these six strategies varies in appropriateness, cost, and feasibility. Moreover, there are numerous variations of the examples we found of each approach that are adapted to the local needs and environment. This section details each of the six strategies, points out some of the advantages and disadvantages, and gives examples of some of the ways schools have used these strategies to meet the time demands for teacher participation in change.

Not all the time-creation mechanisms that follow will be legal, relevant, or appropriate to each school's needs. However, they provide a

framework for inventorying the potential time devices available. And, because they include some approaches that may not have been considered (possibly due to existing regulations), they might spark thinking about this issue in new ways or help establish a case for obtaining waivers or changing the regulations.

Employment of these strategies also is dependent on cost. Most ways of increasing or reallocating time require funding or some equivalent tradeoff with other activities. In addition to paying for consultants, travel, materials, and training, a reform must be budgeted to pay for net increases in time. Although no specific dollar amounts are attached to the list of strategies, an indication of equivalent costs or tradeoffs is identified when possible.

Finally, the use of the term *devices* denotes that this is to some extent a mechanistic list divorced from the rationale of the specific change it is meant to serve. It is worth reiterating that the choice of a specific approach should be based on its compatibility and applicability to the reform itself.

Discussion and examples of these six approaches for creating time follow.

1. PROMOTE TIME OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM DURING THE SCHOOL DAY

The creation of nonclassroom time plays an integral role in the reform of a school. It is the most frequently cited time-creation strategy; in fact, the one that is always cited. Freeing teachers from the classroom takes advantage of training and workshops offered during the school year, allows teachers to observe other classes and schools, and removes some of the burnout associated with trying to change a school primarily on off-duty time. Reforms conducted on the fringes of the school day will never become an integral part of the school.

This category of time devices contains some of the most traditional as well as some of the most imaginative examples garnered in our survey. Several characteristics define the various approaches. First, some draw on existing school personnel, while others depend on outside hires and volunteers. Second, some devices target only one or a small number of teachers at any one time, while others can be used to create time for larger numbers, such as departments or even the whole faculty. Similarly, some devices are geared more to providing relatively short and infrequent nonclassroom time versus more extensive or routine time periods. Finally, the costs associated with the different approaches also vary.

The following describe time-creation devices using substitutes, university faculty and students, and others from outside the school, as well as school personnel.

Substitutes

All school systems use substitute teachers to fill in for classroom teachers who are ill or on a leave of absence. It is therefore not surprising that substitutes are frequently used when teachers leave the classroom for other reasons, such as attending workshops or conferences.

Administrators perceive both advantages and disadvantages to using substitute teachers. For the most part, substitutes are used when the teacher attends training or other events outside the building. Among the perceived advantages is that generally it costs less to hire a substitute than to pay the teacher a stipend to attend the courses on their own time.

Administrators appear more reluctant to employ substitutes for the building-based meetings or other in-house activities requiring less time and no travel. However, a number of schools have adapted their use of substitutes to the more piecemeal time requirements of many in-house activities. For example, some schools hire a "rotating" or "floating" substitute who goes from class to class replacing one teacher at a time so that they can hold conferences, observe other teachers, or engage in other short-term activities. One school superintendent is encouraging peer observations by allowing schools to bank unused substitute hours allocated to the school for a staff development program. A teacher who wants to observe another teacher can then draw on the banked hours to obtain a substitute.

Depending on a school system's location, the biggest drawbacks to the use of substitutes can be the availability and quality of the substitute pool. Where this has been a problem, some districts have developed orientation, staff development, and evaluation programs to increase identification with the district and familiarity with local mores and programs as well as to provide training and a basis for weeding out unsatisfactory performers.[1]

---

[1]For example, see Saundra J. Tracy, "Improve Substitute Teaching with Staff Development," *NASSP BULLETIN*, May 1988; Daniel W. Kraft, "New Approaches to the Substitute Teacher Problem," *NASSP BULLETIN*, September 1980, and Harriet Augustin, "Substitute Teachers: An Endangered Species," *Clearing House*, Vol. 60, May 1987.

Several schools we contacted linked a cadre of substitutes to a specific school or reform effort. A very successful example of such an arrangement was that employed by the Schenley High School Teacher Center in Pittsburgh. In a citywide staff development effort, high school teachers were pulled out of their schools for as long as eight weeks to take part in a professional renewal program at the Schenley Center. Under an agreement with the teachers' union, tenured "replacement teachers" (who would have been laid off due to declining student enrollments) took over the teachers' classrooms in their absence.

In a similar approach, one district we surveyed designated six or seven teachers to be assigned on a regular basis to each of three middle schools participating in a restructuring effort. The substitutes were given titles identifying them with the program and some training on the restructuring effort. District officials hoped that as the substitutes became more familiar with the school, teachers would be less reluctant to leave their classrooms for training. The principal of one of the schools participating in the program found this approach "60 or 70 percent successful" because the substitutes were not always available. The central office assigned them to other schools during down times in the school program, so they often already had jobs when the school needed them again. Participants in a similar approach at a high school reported that the training the designated substitutes received made them attractive full-time hires, resulting in a high turnover of substitutes leaving because of job offers.

Although hiring substitutes remains one of the most widely used approaches to creating noninstructional time during the school day, district and school-level administrators report that teachers increasingly resist leaving the classroom for extended lengths of time. A number of factors contribute to this attitude. First, teachers view their job as being in the classroom. There is a sense that absence on release time is a dereliction of duty. Second, some teachers argue that preparing detailed lesson plans and setting up for a substitute teacher are too time-consuming. For example, in recent interviews at 12 schools implementing a staff development program using peer observations, a substantial proportion of the teachers told the authors that it was easier to do the conferencing and observations on their own time—lunch, preparation time, or after school—than to take advantage of the offer of a substitute.

A third factor is the tendency on the part of nonparticipating teachers to complain that heavy reliance on substitutes contributes to student unrest, thereby making more work for the remaining teachers. This

perception can fuel divisions between participating and nonparticipating faculty. One principal interviewed for this study related how the small minority of teachers outside the school improvement program got so angry over the frequent absences of program participants that they began calling in sick when they knew a substantial number of teachers would be away for program training. In response, the principal limited the number of participating teachers who could be out of the school on any given day. Finally, a teacher's extensive absence from the classroom can lead to complaints from the parents who, even when they know that the underlying purpose is school improvement, perceive an adverse effect on the quality of their children's education.

Cooperative Arrangements with Universities

Our survey garnered a number of examples of creative arrangements between universities and local schools that enabled university faculty and students to take over classrooms. For those participating, these arrangements generally are perceived as beneficial to both parties. Schools gain assistance at a reduced cost to their budget; faculty and students gain an opportunity to apply their knowledge or conduct research in a real-world laboratory.

In one example of this approach, the Brigham Young University secondary education department has an arrangement by which it takes its social studies student teachers into the schools for two or three weeks. The first week is orientation. In subsequent weeks the student teachers take charge of the classroom while the regular teachers participate in staff development activities, at either the university or the school. There is no charge for the student teachers' time. They do it as part of their student teaching requirement, which totals 15 hours of credit.[2]

We found other examples in our survey. As part of an arrangement to provide support to a local intermediate school undergoing major restructuring, Auburn University contributes the services of two half-time graduate assistants who free up teachers in the classroom for other activities. In examples of other partnerships, university faculty took over courses or segments of courses, thereby freeing teachers' time.

---

[2]For a perspective on Brigham Young University's partnership with five local school districts, see C. Garn Coombs and J. Merrell Hansen, "Lessons Learned," *Educational Horizons*, Summer 1990.

Other Outside Resources

Finally, schools sometimes draw on others in the community to create nonclassroom time. For the most part, these are volunteer activities, which make them low-cost solutions to creating time. For example, one district is considering asking the county recreation department to take over a school for one afternoon, leaving virtually the entire faculty free for other activities.

Similarly, many schools recruit outside speakers to make presentations to both individual classes and assemblies, thereby freeing some teachers' time. Although this strategy is usually employed infrequently, we found examples of elementary schools scheduling weekly assemblies to create faculty planning time on a regular basis.

The most frequent example of tapping outside resources is the use of individual volunteers, especially parents, during the school day. These volunteers can take over some of the administrative and monitoring duties that often preoccupy teachers' noninstructional time. In elementary schools especially, where teachers have more extensive custodial duties and parents are more likely to actively participate in the school, volunteers become lunchroom or hallway monitors and lunch or field trip money collectors and recorders, as well as administrative aides. These volunteers also serve as teachers' aides, and in some instances the school provides them with training. The extent to which volunteers can be used in the classroom and even as monitors can be limited by local district policies, union contracts, and insurance policies.

Using School Personnel to Create Nonclassroom Time

Schools often look to their own resources to provide substitutes for the classroom. Such strategies can enlist the participation of administrators or almost anyone from the staff roster. The willingness of administrators to act as substitutes can influence faculty perceptions of a reform effort. It demonstrates a level of support and commitment to a program beyond the usual lip service all efforts receive.

Our survey netted a variety of devices using school personnel to substitute for classroom teachers. Some examples follow.

- At the beginning of the year, the principal issues each teacher a ticket, which can be exchanged for his substitute services. Giving a few days of notice, teachers can cash in the ticket any time during the year and the principal will take over the classroom.

- By combining classes for joint presentations, one or more teachers can be released from the classroom.
- Kindergarten teachers whose classes have an early dismissal substitute in other classes once a month for an hour at the end of the day so teachers in the school's governance team can meet.
- A group of English teachers implementing a new curriculum are relieved of homeroom duty to meet weekly. Staff having no homeroom take their place.

Some schools create time for teachers by providing alternative student activities. For example, in the New York Central Park East School, secondary students do community service for two hours once a week while teachers have planning time. A middle school in Florida has set up a peer mentoring program for potential dropouts during one period of the day, thereby creating time for teachers to conduct team planning. Similarly, students can be sent to the library to conduct independent studies while the teacher pursues other activities.[3]

Finally, a more fundamental method of creating nonclassroom time is to adjust the school's roster and the job descriptions of its teachers to support target areas. Schools that have some discretion in the staffing can convert positions to accommodate the school's needs. For example, a junior high school eliminated a vice principal's position to hire two teachers who also took on counseling and disciplinary duties. An elementary school took a similar approach to hire a dozen teachers' aides. Another elementary school converted a classroom teacher position to that of a visiting teacher. The visiting teacher goes into other teachers' classrooms to model teaching techniques, observe and provide feedback, and allow the classroom teacher to observe other classes. The principal credits this approach with changing the school culture in terms of teachers' professional relations and promoting more effective teaching.

As this last example illustrates, a more systemic approach to creating time outside the classroom is to develop a wider variety of teachers' job definitions, which include nonclassroom time for activities that advance and maintain governance and pedagogical and staff development reforms. For example, each high school in Pittsburgh has a teacher who is also a facilitator for that school's staff development

[3]This last example is suggested by Bruce Joyce and Beverly Showers in *Student Achievement Through Staff Development*, New York: Longman, 1988. In a chapter entitled "Buying Time," Joyce and Showers suggest some of the general approaches that appeared in our survey to create time for teachers to study models of teaching using peer coaching.

and shared decisionmaking activities. The facilitator teaches half-time but serves as a coordinator, liaison, and "seller of programs" the rest of the time.[4]

Other examples of job enhancements or enlargements exist. In Charlotte-Mecklenberg, mentor teachers are given one day every six weeks to spend in the district's resource center. In New York, facilitators and peer reviewers have reduced classroom schedules to devote time to their other responsibilities.

2. REFOCUS THE PURPOSE OF EXISTING TIME COMMITMENTS

One alternative to creating time for new activities is to appropriate existing time slots. Our survey suggested a number of ways schools have modified the focus of established activities to facilitate the changes being promoted in the school. We found examples of three school activities that were redirected toward promoting reform.

The most frequently cited examples deal with the appropriation of at least part or all of such existing forums as *faculty meetings* and *grade or department meetings*. Faculty meetings, which in many schools are used to communicate administrative decisions and policies, have been converted to general assemblies for school-based management, opportunities to discuss education research issues, or organizational meetings for devising reform implementation strategies. Both faculty and department meetings have been applied to small-group planning activities. For example, one district gave teachers faculty meeting time to practice and talk about peer coaching skills. In these instances, the original administrative nature of these meetings was handled by distributing memoranda or devoting only a fraction of the meeting time to such issues.

A second, less frequently cited approach is to refocus *districtwide staff development days* to support local school reforms. Seattle's School-Focused Leadership consortium (part of the state's Schools for the 21st Century) empowered local school staff and councils to create their own staff development program. Individual schools chose between consortiumwide workshops (based on polls of member schools' interests) and on-site training in specific areas, such as computer skills, conflict mediation, and curriculum integration. Many of the

[4]See Deboarah S. Saltrick, Judy A. Johnston, and William E. Bickel, "Establishing Organization Development Strategies in Secondary Schools," *Journal of Staff Development*, Vol. 12, No. 1, Winter 1991.

schools combined district, consortia, and building in-services in an effort to design an overall program that supported restructuring efforts in the school.[5]

Finally, a number of schools have experimented with using *summer school* as a laboratory for teachers to practice new teaching strategies. Teachers are paid for initial and daily planning time. They can then use the summer program to become familiar with the changes without the distractions present during the rest of the school year. Often such arrangements, sometimes known as tent schools, serve more of an enrichment than remediation function for participating students.[6] All the examples of this approach were sponsored at least partially by outside funding, and the continued existence of these summer programs became doubtful once the grants ended.

3. RESCHEDULE THE SCHOOL DAY

School administrators employ a number of devices to schedule time during the day for teachers' activities outside the classroom. Most of the examples that follow are done within the existing day; however, there are variations in these approaches that necessitate adding some minutes to the day.

Adjusting the Master Schedule

School schedules have always included some nonclassroom time for teachers in the schedule. In elementary schools teachers often get preparation time while their students attend some specialist program such as physical education, music, or art. In secondary schools, teachers usually have at least one free period a day with no class assignment. A means of aiding school reform is to adjust the schedule so that teachers working together on change have the same preparation and lunch periods.

Yet simply creating compatible schedules does not provide the time needed for the added burden of participating in changing a school. Most teachers spend preparation time doing a number of tasks such

---

[5]See Seattle Schools for the 21st Century, *School-Focused Leadership, Annual Report, 1990*, Seattle Public Schools, 1991.

[6]See Richard W. Strong et al., "Thoughtful Education: Staff Development for the 1990s," *Educational Leadership*, February 1990; and Jane L. David and Barbara Campbell MacPhee, "Changing School Structure in the Summer," *Educational Leadership*, February 1988.

as photocopying, telephoning parents, or grading papers in addition to any classroom "preparation."

Expanding the time available to teachers appears to be somewhat easier for secondary schools than elementary schools. The fragmentation of the high school day into periods is more likely to ensure a given amount of time off. Elementary teachers, on the other hand, may be more susceptible to losing their preparation time. A sick art teacher absent for the day may eliminate preparation time altogether. Moreover, because students generally are assigned to one teacher for the whole day, it is more difficult to schedule the teacher away from the classroom.

In the case of secondary teachers, the most straightforward solution has been to give teachers more nonclassroom time by expanding the number of periods in a day without increasing a teacher's classroom instruction assignments. Days that had been divided into six to eight periods are converted to seven to nine periods. For teachers, this means an additional noninstructional period. Often the additional period is tied to some specific purpose. For example, with the introduction of teaming, the second free period is often designated for team meetings. In the middle schools, administrators have begun creating an extra period as tutorials where teachers touch base with a smaller number of students. In one school using a nine-period day, teachers get three nonclassroom periods—one for individual preparation, one for interdisciplinary meetings, and one for discipline meetings.

In most of the examples we found, this approach is relatively cost free because the existing day simply is redivided. The main drawbacks are a brisker teaching pace and, if no additional faculty are hired, larger classes. The principal of a Baltimore middle school experimenting with an eight-period day reported that the addition of one period had necessitated cutting back each period from almost an hour to 45 minutes. A survey at the end of the first year of the experiment revealed that while a slight majority of the teachers favored the approach, many teachers, especially those with longer setup times for such classes as art and physical education, felt the pace too rushed. From the principal's viewpoint, the addition of a team planning period gave teachers more time to conference with other teachers and with parents as well as become more involved with the students. It resulted in more interdisciplinary planning and a greater likelihood that teachers will turn to the team for help.

In some instances, when an extra period has been created, the school day also has been increased. The result has not always contributed to extra time for teachers to participate in change. For example, when

Milwaukee added a period to its middle schools, the plan also called for a longer day so that instructional time per period could be maintained. The teachers, through the terms of their contract with the district, opted to give up time allocated to their planning period rather than extend the school day.

In another scheduling approach, the combination of teaming and block time has created more flexibility in allocating time for both elementary and secondary school teachers. Teams of two to four teachers are responsible for the core curriculum provided to a given number of students. Blocks of time are set aside in the morning and/or afternoon for that instruction, and the team decides how to allocate that time for instruction. In secondary schools, the teams have free time outside the blocks when students attend elective courses or other activities. In elementary schools, teams can use nonblock time for a variety of purposes, including offering students enhancement activities or reassigning students among the entire school staff to create small-group activities, such as reading. Under these schemes the rotation among team members could free individual teachers during the day, as would the time when students receive nonteam instruction.

Rescheduling to Bank Time

Many schools also adjust schedules to accommodate the demands of teachers meeting in groups by banking hours toward students' early dismissal. For example, one middle school has asked for its district's permission to eliminate the daily ten-minute homeroom. By having the first-period teacher take attendance instead, the school can "bank" or accrue that homeroom time, eventually converting it to six half-day early dismissals. The school will then use three of those days for teacher-parent conferences and three as in-services. Similar schemes bank five or ten minutes off the lunch period.

Schools sometimes achieve the same result by adding a few minutes to each day. For example, in Missouri's Accelerated Schools program, one school adds five minutes to the school day in exchange for two mornings per semester for planning. Another adds 15 minutes a day in exchange for a planning day about every five weeks.

The advantage of this approach is that it is relatively cost free. Most schools doing this noted that the only price tag is transportation, i.e., an extra bus trip for students who either are dismissed early or begin school late.

The drawback is that schemes that involve adding minutes to the day or adjusting teachers' free time, such as lunch period, do not always

meet the approval of the district or the teachers union. The use of early dismissals is particularly unpopular with district officials because they often result in working parents' complaints that a change in the routine school schedule upsets their after-school child care arrangements.

Routine Early Dismissals

A final variation on rescheduling to create time is to build early dismissal into the weekly or monthly schedule. For example, Fairfax County elementary schools have an early dismissal every Monday for teachers to have planning time. In San Diego, schools have a *minimum day*, when students go home at 12 or 12:30 once a week. Faculty use the time for staff development, preparation time, or planning. At Holt High School in Michigan, students do not arrive until 11:30 a.m. on Wednesdays; faculty hold planning meetings the first three weeks and participate in professional development focus groups on the fourth Wednesday of the month. Members of Seattle's School-Focused Leadership program obtained waivers for early release days, and each organized their use differently. For example, one school routinely scheduled two early dismissals a month for faculty workshops.[7] A Florida school district allots one-half day per month for planning but gives waivers for such early dismissals only to schools initiating a site-based management program.

4. INCREASE THE AMOUNT OF TIME AVAILABLE

An obvious way to create time is to have longer work days or years. However, such an approach also means that teachers and staff are paid for increased time on the job. Aside from the use of substitutes, this category of strategies represented the most frequent means of creating time in our survey. The fact that our survey included so many grant programs may have influenced that result. Principals and district officers we interviewed often noted that what the grant provided them was time to try these reforms. By that they meant that they were given the financial resources to hire substitutes, hold weekend retreats, send teachers to summer training, and pay stipends for teachers to extend their participation beyond the usual work hours. For the most part, financing is a key element in adding time to the work week or year.

We found a number of ways schools have added time.

[7]See *Seattle Schools for the 2st Century*, op. cit.

- *Supplemental contracts:* Participating teachers are paid for up to a specified number of days beyond the standard teaching year at either full pay or as a percentage increase of annual pay. Usually, such an offer is tied to a specific program. For example, legislation authorizing Washington state's Schools for the 21st Century program provided up to ten-day supplemental contracts to certified school staff participating in the program. In a follow-up survey, program participants indicated that this was the most important component of the program. However, because this represented nonschool time, schools came up with different strategies as to how to use those days. During the first year of the program in one school system, the days were applied to weekends and evening meetings during the school year. Many teachers found the scheduling too hectic, and in the second year the time was redistributed in a week-long summer session, with time for follow-up sessions during the school year.
- *Stipends:* Paying daily stipends, usually two-thirds of a teacher's daily salary, is the most frequent approach to extending the year. Usually used to reimburse a teacher's attendance at a workshop, summer institute, or retreat during nonschool hours, it has the advantage of creating time that is freer from the ongoing demands of school in session and that can be used by a large number of teachers. The biggest disadvantage is that it generally is a more expensive time-creation device than using substitutes. Many of the examples in our survey were supplemented by grants or a division of costs associated with an event among several entities—e.g., the state pays the tuition, the district provides the transportation and housing, and the grant covers the stipend.
- *Increased contract days:* Some states and districts have added days to the teachers' contract. Although, in some instances, this represents a lengthening of the school year or a conversion to year-round education, districts also use this when school is not in session as a means of adding time for staff development or planning.[8]

[8]Simply increasing the school year does not in itself create more noninstructional time for teachers. In fact, it can make it more difficult for teachers to take summer courses or workshops. In addition, schools that use the year-round concept to maximize facility use have only three-quarters of the students and faculty in school during any one quarter. Therefore, any attempts to change the school are hampered by the fact that a substantial segment of the faculty is absent at any one time. However, the vacationing teachers often serve as substitutes, thus solving the problem of low-quality substitutes or a limited number of available substitutes.

Such an arrangement promotes participation by all the staff without the competing influences of the classroom. However, of all the approaches, it is considered the most expensive.

5. PROMOTE VOLUNTEER TIME

A recurrent theme in all our interviews concerning change in school was that it was dependent on the teachers' volunteering their own time—whether within the school day such as at lunchtime meetings or in conferences held during preparation times—or outside school hours—before and after school, on weekends, or during the summer recess.

Many, however, are wary of overreliance on the use of volunteer time to change the schools. Such an approach is likely to exclude some and overburden, or possibly even burn out, those enthusiastic or loyal enough to devote their own time. In one school that had just instituted site-based management on the teachers' own time and was beginning to reorganize into team teaching without allocated common planning periods, the teachers went to the administration and warned that unless teams were given planning time during the day, both reforms—in governance and pedagogy—would be in jeopardy because teachers were overburdened.

We found that schools encourage teachers' using their own time by, first, promoting conditions that make it easier to volunteer time and, second, providing rewards or incentives for volunteering time.

Creating Conducive Conditions

Schools and districts employ a number of devices that make it easier to volunteer or improve the conditions under which volunteer time is spent. Some examples follow.

- The school provides baby-sitting services for after-school hours or Saturday meetings.
- Administrators limit after-school competition by such devices as embargoing any other meetings on certain days or restricting the number of committees or projects an individual teacher can join.
- Compatible schedules for teachers' free time, such as for lunch or prep periods, are drawn up so that teachers who are working together on a project have common free time.
- Space is allocated in the school for a teachers' conference or meeting room to make it easier to meet.

- A business in partnership with an inner-city high school facilitates evening meetings by providing funds to keep the school open one night a week. (District regulations prevent building use unless a custodian is present.) In addition, the business offers school staff the use of its own conference facilities, an opportunity to hold evening meetings in a secure and attractive setting.

Rewards and Incentives

States, districts, and local schools have devised a number of ways to compensate teachers for using their free time to further the interests of the school. While we have already discussed how some school systems have extended the teachers' year to include staff development days or planning days, we also discovered a number of professional development funds and programs that provide stipends and other incentives for teachers to participate in activities that enhance both their professional development and ongoing reforms in the school.

We found examples of professional development programs connected to school improvement at all levels of school governance. For example, in July 1990, the Virginia Department of Education instituted a revised five-year recertification program for teachers. Previously, recertification required a given number of hours of credit for course work. The state now offers alternative routes, including participating in peer observation or curriculum development, as ways to earn points toward recertification.[9] Some districts have already begun connecting their own programs to recertification. For example, the Portsmouth Public Schools are using the Effective Schools model to change the schools. Some of the work is being done in Saturday meetings for which teachers receive both stipends and recertification points.

We talked with two districts—one large urban district in Florida and one rural district in New York—that after consultation with local teachers unions, converted funds formerly earmarked for sabbaticals to professional development funds. In both cases, teachers apply for funding to attend courses, programs, and workshops, or to work on projects with other teachers. The New York superintendent believes that with the limited resources of his district, this helps keep the school system "on the cutting edge." The money has been used for

[9]See Office of Professional Development and Teacher Education, *The Virginia Recertification Manual*, Richmond, Virginia: Department of Education, Commonwealth of Virginia, July 1990.

English teachers to develop a new curriculum and a music teacher to attend a summer course on the Gordon method. In the latter case, the teacher taught the rest of the music department this method and thereby changed the way music is taught in the whole district.

Even at the school level, we found an example of a principal who sells Popsicles in his school and uses the profits to pay registration fees and other expenses so members of the faculty can attend relevant workshops, courses, or conferences.

As in the example of assigning recertification points, schools have found a number of nonmonetary ways to reward teachers for contributing their own time, including the following:

- Assignment of compensatory time for attending after-school meetings. One principal allowed teachers to compensate for attendance at an after-school study group by choosing another day when they could leave school as soon as the students were dismissed. Even though many of the teachers told us that they rarely had "time" to take the principal up on the offer, they appreciated this recognition of their efforts.
- In one school district, teachers can earn up to three days' vacation by participating in weekend or summer training. In a junior high school, teachers who spend a certain amount of time peer coaching can earn points toward a personal leave day.

6. PROMOTE MORE EFFICIENT TIME USE

Schools employ a number of approaches to accomplish tasks more efficiently and reduce demands on teachers' time. Of particular interest to this study are the application of time-management techniques and the increasing use of technologies such as computers and distance learning.

It could be argued that the time-saving techniques falling in this category are actually an effort to create a more efficient operation and that they have little relevance to whether a school is instituting changes or not. However, our survey revealed that, at times, the decision to adopt a change can be contingent on making it a relatively efficient task.

For example, a recent trend in education has been to develop measures of student achievement that do not rely on standardized paper and pencil tests. One alternative is for each student to develop a portfolio of exhibits. For teachers, this represents a much more time-

consuming approach; so much so that several schools in our survey decided not to use portfolios. Computers might be applied to this task, but at the time of our interviews, no commercial software existed, although some schools have made the creation of such software part of their restructuring effort.

Time-Management Techniques

School staff in the throes of reform or just maintaining the status quo demonstrate an interest in time-saving devices, especially those that reduce the administrative burden. A substantial literature exists on reducing paperwork, which can indirectly help create time for other activities.[10]

Techniques that are particularly relevant to this study apply to the conduct of meetings. Many programs promoting change include training for participants or facilitators on holding meetings. Although the purpose of the guidelines may be to deal with conflicts, build consensus, or achieve other goals, they also make attending the meetings a more attractive expenditure of time. Goals often include keeping meetings focused, eliminating personal rancor, and keeping meetings to a reasonable length of time. Pre-established agendas, agreement by participants concerning personal conduct, and time limits for discussion on specific items serve to make attendance at a meeting more attractive and time-efficient.[11]

Computer and Communication Technologies

The advantage of the computer and communication technologies is their operation in terms of time and geography. Approaches such as teleconferencing or satellite learning can facilitate participation of teachers in different locations, thereby reducing the time and cost as-

[10]See, for example, Judith M. Cochran, "Escape From Paperwork," *Instructor*, November/December 1989; Margie Krest, "Time On My Hands: Handling the Paper Load," *English Journal*, December 1987; or Carol L. Fuery, "Finding More Time," *English Journal*, September 1985.

[11]In their research on how local contexts affected the ability of a technical assistance agency to work with schools in changing instructional strategy, H. Dickson Corbett et al. noted, "Although most teachers were convinced that making classroom changes was important, they wanted to devote a limited amount of time to formal planning. Consequently, field agents and administrators occasionally decreased meeting time, carried out some planning tasks themselves or with smaller groups of teachers, and omitted or abbreviated some planning steps." See H. Dickson Corbett, Judith A. Dawson, and William A. Firestone, *School Context and School Change: Implications for Effective Planning*, New York: Teachers College Press, 1984, p. 77.

sociated with travel. Also, some formats make it possible for teachers to participate at their own convenience, rather than having to schedule all the participants at the same time. For example, teachers who share problems or solicit solutions via electronic mail or bulletin boards can respond or react to suggestions on their own timetable.

Although such technologies can enhance efficiency in terms of handling large data bases and word processing, disadvantages can include the costs of equipment and operation, teachers' lack of familiarity with the technology, and the constraints imposed by the type and configuration of the particular systems chosen for a school.[12]

Here are some examples we found of using computer and telecommunication technologies to relieve time demands.

- In an arrangement with a local university, a middle school teacher has students compose essays on the computer. These are downloaded and modemed to a computer lab at the university, where English majors review and comment on students' efforts.
- In an elementary school, senior teachers have created a video library demonstrating various teaching techniques and classroom projects for the use of other teachers, especially beginning teachers. The video tapes provide a resource that can be checked out at any time and viewed at the teachers' convenience. If, after viewing the tape, the teachers have a question, they can contact the teacher who made the demonstration.
- A teacher who is comfortable with word processing uses a laptop computer to record notes during a meeting. These can be posted immediately or copies put in each mailbox to enhance communication among teachers without taking time to compose and type minutes after the meeting. A similar approach has been used to produce a committee report. The process streamlined the development of the report by making it easier to produce revised versions and solicit feedback on the changes.
- To save travel time, the Illinois State Board of Education uses video teleconferencing to train participants implementing the Accelerated Schools model at 25 separate locations.
- The Cleveland Museum of Natural History presented a seminar on evolution geared to area teachers, who could earn one credit by at-

[12]Two recent summaries of how computer and telecommunications technologies are being applied to education include Ibrahim M. Hefzallah, ed., *The New Learning and Telecommunications Technologies*, Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1990; and "Electronic Links for Learning," *The Annals*, March 1991.

tending the seminar and developing a curriculum unit on evolution. The seminar was shown by a local public broadcast station, and teachers were given the opportunity to call in questions during the broadcast.[13]

In closing this survey of time-creation devices, it should be noted that schools rarely depend on just one solution to the problem. Rather, each school employs a number of devices to create needed time.

---

[13]Susan Stover and Janice McLean, "An Evolution and Education Seminar for Teachers," *Journal of Geological Education*, Vol. 38, 1990.

4. PROMOTING TIME FOR REFORM

Time is an important resource in changing schools. As the preceding inventory illustrates, administrators and staff—working within the traditional structure of the school day and year—devise a number of ways to create blocks of time. However, this difficult task continues to be one of the major hurdles to accomplishing change. Currently, that hurdle can be lowered significantly by the actions of a wide range of participants who direct or influence public education. In the future, the education reforms themselves should provide more systemic solutions by restructuring the organization of both staff and school time.

LOWERING BARRIERS TO CREATING TIME

The challenge to those who direct or influence public education is to adopt policies and programs that take into consideration the role of time in bringing about change in the schools. They can assist the provisions of adequate time in a number of ways.

State education agencies and **legislatures** should

- Apply a realistic time frame to school reform programs.
- Incorporate adequate financing and time provisions as part of the reform.
- Minimize any administrative requirements at the school level that make implementing a reform unduly burdensome or time-consuming.
- Insure that current regulations and statutes do not impede schools from implementing legitimate reforms.
- Review required curricula and regulations on a regular basis to eliminate those that are no longer relevant or mandated.
- Allow local school systems and schools some control over defining their time usage.

In promoting more effective use of teachers' professional time, **unions** should

- Actively facilitate waivers when contract provisions needlessly become barriers to teachers' participation in school reform.

- Educate their constituency on the advantages of negotiating a wider range of teacher job descriptions, which include performing noninstructional professional duties during the school day.
- Advocate job enhancements or enlargements as well as extended contracts to include professional development time.

Foundations and **business partners** committed to facilitating education reform should

- Provide an alternative source of time-creation resources by contributing financing, human capital, equipment, or facilities.
- Extend that support over a number of years to permit change to be adopted.
- Serve as an influential ally to schools seeking local and state waivers.
- Avoid either overloading a school with reform activities or diverting staff time to competing agendas.

To aid individual school or districtwide reforms, **local education agencies** should

- Formulate reforms in the context of other ongoing initiatives and programs to prevent overloaded agendas or conflicting mandates.
- Grant waivers of district policies or contracts that unreasonably hinder reforms.
- Set program milestones in a realistic time frame.
- Provide resources for staff to not only participate in program events but also sustain the reform back in the school.
- Keep administrative requirements at the school, and especially the class level, to a minimum.
- Enlist resources for the program from such sources as foundations, federal grants, the community, parents, or businesses if the district is unable to adequately support the reform.
- Institutionalize staff planning time and professional development days so they become a routinized part of the school day or calendar.
- Explore more varied teacher job descriptions that dedicate a portion of the school day to professional noninstructional duties.
- Give schools at least some flexibility over scheduling the day.

At the building level, **school administrators** should

- Make the reform a priority in the school.
- Support the elimination of nonessential policies, practices, or rules that hinder spending time on reform.
- Institutionalize common planning time as well as promote other opportunities in the daily schedule for staff to meet and work together.
- Inventory all the possible time-creation devices and then select time slots appropriate to the purpose.
- Provide staff with time for the follow-up activities that sustain the reform.
- Be entrepreneurial about enlisting outside support from such sources as businesses, foundations, other education institutions, or government agencies.

Finally, the **school staff** should

- Make the program a priority and, correspondingly, be willing to abandon some existing commitments.
- Promote more opportunities to meet together or observe each other during the school day.
- Use time slots appropriate to the purpose.

MAKING THE ORGANIZATION OF SCHOOL TIME THE OBJECT OF REFORM

In reviewing the ways schools create time, it is evident that noninstructional time has little sanction in the school workplace. Most of the devices used to create time involve the fringes of the day (before and after school) or borrowed snatches of time (preparation or lunch periods, which exist for other purposes). When time is created during the day, it usually involves extra work, such as setting up lesson plans for substitutes, recruiting and training parents and volunteers, or organizing assemblies and field days. The education system really promotes noninstructional activities only when the time provided is integral to the organization of the school, such as common planning time, routine minimum days, extended contracts for professional days, or reduced class time so teachers can fulfill other professional roles (lead teacher, program facilitator, etc.).

This study examines how schools currently create time for reform, but the results highlight the need to reform the organization of school time itself. Reorganization seems inevitable as schools adopt varying pedagogical approaches that clash with the existing order. For example, a reform aimed at increasing student learning by employing a mixture of instructional techniques—lectures, seminars, independent studies, tutorials, and coaching—cannot be implemented if the day is divided into equal instructional periods. Adoption of this reform necessitates reorganizing student and teacher schedules, since it is likely the entire teaching staff, and even the administrative staff, would be deployed to tutorial and coaching duties, assignments that necessitate some common planning time.

Changes in the school day and year are already occurring in response to the needs of the community. Shifts in family and societal structures have stretched the school day. Meeting the needs of latchkey children, at-risk students and dropouts, or adults lacking high school diplomas has resulted in schools that remain open after regular classes end, during evenings, and on Saturdays for day care and recreation as well as remedial, enrichment, GED, or even parenting classes. Increasingly, districts experiment with the various forms of year-round education for reasons ranging from increased facility requirements to the belief that students lose too much ground academically during a long summer break.

As changes in the organization of schools occur by pedagogical design or as a response to environmental demands, deliberate attention needs to be applied to the creation and provision of adequate time for teachers to continue to learn and apply that learning to reforming schools. Only if time for these activities becomes an integral part of the school and its organization can real reform of the education system continue.